

Serial No.: 10/611,509
Docket No.: 60655.1300

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action mailed on January 24, 2005 within the shortened statutory three-month period for reply. Claims 1-5 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-5. Applicants cancel claims 1-5 and add new claims 6-15. Support for the new claims may be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these new claims. Claims 6-15 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wason, U.S. Patent Application No 2004/0268235 ("Wason"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To clarify the invention, Applicants cancel claims 1-5, without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter previously therein, and add new claims 6-15, so the Examiner's rejection is now moot. However, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicants differentiate new claims 6-15 from the cited reference.

Wason generally discloses a method for editing rich text within a standard web browser, wherein edits may include changing the font face, size, color, underline, bold, italic, etc. Rich Text Format (RTF) is a file format that expands the utility of standard text by providing a number of properties governing the appearance of the text. Wason discloses the storage and retrieval of text within various formats (e.g., CLOB, html representation, text and plain text). The various text formats, or representations, serve different purposes. For example, a "plain-text" representation may facilitate editing of text, while a standard "text" representation may support spell-checking functionality. Wason is not directed toward a system for searching the content of a database and is limited to disclosing only the storage of various representations of text, none of which qualify as Binary Large Object (BLOB) content. As such, Wason does not disclose or suggest at least the "searching for said text string within said second field" step recited in new independent claim 6.

New claims 7-15 variously depend from new independent claim 6, therefore dependent claims 7-15 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above for differentiating independent claim 6, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Serial No.: 10/611,509
Docket No.: 60655.1300

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner next rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Liaguno et al., U.S. Patent No 5,729,741 ("Liaguno"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To clarify the invention, Applicants cancel claims 1-5, without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter previously therein, and add new claims 6-15, so the Examiner's rejection is now moot. However, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicants differentiate new claims 6-15 from the cited reference.

Liaguno generally discloses a system for storing various forms of media along with transcriptions. The transcriptions enable a user to search for phrases or keywords within the transcript in order to locate pertinent audio, video or document scans. Liaguno is limited to the use of optical character recognition (OCR) to create a textual version of a scanned document. Further, Liaguno is limited to utilizing voice recognition software to create textual transcripts of audio and video content. The transcribed documents, audio portion and video portion are stored with their respective digitized format within a computer memory structure. Liaguno constructs a textual representation of digital files; however, Liaguno does not extract any data from the files. As such, Liaguno does not disclose or suggest at least the "converting said binary content into text content" step as recited by new independent claim 6.

New claims 7-15 variously depend from new independent claim 6, therefore dependent claims 7-15 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above for differentiating independent claim 6, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner next rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakefield et al., U.S. Patent No 6,741,988 ("Wakefield"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To clarify the invention, Applicants cancel claims 1-5, without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter previously therein, and add new claims 6-15, so the Examiner's rejection is now moot. However, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicants differentiate new claims 6-15 from the cited reference.

Wakefield generally discloses a system for providing more accurate and consistent results based on a text search. Specifically, Wakefield discloses four processes for parsing and analyzing text in order to create indexes that have a greater level of natural language

Serial No.: 10/611,509
Docket No.: 60655.1300

understanding. Wakefield is limited to a relational text index which stores various attributes relating to documents. The relational text index contains extracted file information, sentence information, theta role information, semantic hierarchy and semantic classes. All of this information is used to process a text search to more accurately produce relevant texts. Wakefield is not directed to the storage of the subject file. In other words, the index contains a link, or a location identifier to point to a storage location for a located file. For example, an index contains a natural language analysis for an article relating to South American weather patterns. The article may reside in any server across a network; however, it does not exist within the relational text index. Rather the index contains a link to the article to enable a user to access the document in much the same way an Internet search engine provides links to search results. Moreover, while the index of Wakefield contains very specific information about a document, including the document contents, it is not an exact textual copy of a binary equivalent. As such, Wakefield does not disclose or suggest at least the "storing said binary content within a first field of said record" step as recited by independent claim 6.

New claims 7-15 variously depend from new independent claim 6, therefore dependent claims 7-15 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above for differentiating independent claim 6, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. Applicants invite the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/4/05

By: 

Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com

AXP Docket No. TH200314099
LEVENDM/PHX/1652288.2